



The Caleb Report

September-October 2000

Life Decisions International

vol. viii • no. 5

In this Issue: *Election 2000 / Republicans and NRLC Criticized / Communist Forced Abortion Policy / A Pro-Life Vision / Caught Between A Rock... / Childbirth Good, Abortion Bad / Conference Reminder / The Pill Is Not The World's Savior / The Prayer Project / Working For Two / Parents Vs. The State / Quotable Quote / The Less Obvious Enemy / Positive Polls Released / Action Speaks Louder*

ELECTION 2000

On July 27, 2000, Dick Cheney, R-Mont., who had previously opposed abortion under all circumstances, said he would embrace George W. Bush's position, which makes exceptions for rape, incest and the life of the mother. "You know abortion is a very tough issue for everybody," Cheney said. "From the standpoint of the Republican Party, we need to recognize that we do have people with a broad variety of views in the Party, and everybody ought to be welcome in the party regardless on their views on that question." Cheney made the remarks on "Fox News."

Human Events, *The Wall Street Journal* and several other publications are reporting that prominent Jewish leaders have taken on Senator Joseph Lieberman, D-Conn., due to his position on abortion. Lieberman has consistently supported abortion in the Senate, even voting five times against a ban on partial-birth abortion.

Under traditional Jewish law, "a woman can have an abortion only if her physical existence is threatened, during all stages of development," said Rabbi Daniel Lapin, president of Toward Tradition, an organization consisting of pro-life Jews and Christians. "I can say that I am 100 percent convinced that Jewish tradition demands that Jews align themselves with the religious pro-life movement."

"You will always find a rabbi who will back up the vice-presidential candidate," Lapin said. He explained that although abortion is generally proscribed, "the fetus is not a person" under Jewish law. Nor is there necessarily anything that would demand that Lieberman vote for the pro-life legislation that has come before him.

"I have no interest in being his policeman of piety," Lapin said. "I can say that his record appears to contradict Jewish values." Lapin, who served with Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI, on the Declaration Committee of the World Congress of Families II, explained that the Jewish teaching is that the prohibition on abortion applies to all people, not just Jews.

"The Noachite laws specifically cover them," Lapin said. The seven laws God gave to Noah and his descendants apply to all people, whereas the other laws of the Torah apply only to Jews, he explained.

Rabbi Steven Dworken, spokesman for the Rabbinical Council of America, the largest association of Orthodox rabbis in the country, said he did not want to discuss Lieberman's specific record on abortion. As a matter of general principle, he said, "Judaism is not pro-abortion, it is anti-abortion, except in certain instances." Usually the exceptions are understood to be limited to "the life of the mother," he said, but some rabbis have wrongly "extended them to the mental life of the mother."

In an article distributed by the Orthodox Union, America's largest organization of Orthodox congregations, Rabbi Yaacov Haber writes, "If a greater part of the fetus had emerged, or if the head had emerged, then the fetus possesses the status of a person and cannot be dismembered, as one may not take another one's life in order to save his own." In a partial-birth abortion, all but the head of the fetus emerges from the body before it is killed.

Haber wrote that the consensus Orthodox view is that the only justification for abortion is to prevent severe injury to the mother.

Criticism by pro-life leaders, both Jewish and Christian, is not limited to Lieberman. After reading a publication from Gary Bauer that praised Lieberman's references to God, LDI's vice chairman, Patti Lyman, Esq., wrote:

Maybe I'm losing my mind, but if I hear one more person who calls themselves either a Christian, faithful Jew, or pro-lifer engage in any more verbal genuflection toward Joe Lieberman, simply because he talks about "God," I'm going to scream. I was forwarded some newsletter from a well known Christian pro-lifer in which he's praising Lieberman for being such a "religious and moral man," but this author is just one more example of so many who are jumping on this bandwagon, "ooh-ing" and "aah-ing" over a man who they have obviously forgotten thinks it's okay to stick scissors in a baby's skull and suck its brains out. I was there in 1996 in the Senate gallery the day Lieberman cast his first vote ensuring that this particular form of infanticide would continue with the full blessing and support of this government.

If people think Lieberman's references to "God" are something to be applauded, then they need to remember that apparently the "God" he's talking about is a false god, some sort of baby-killing, "good time Charlie" god who just says "if it feels good, do it," and to hell (literally) with the consequences—if the consequence is an inconvenient baby, just kill it. That's the "Lieberman doctrine," according to his voting record. He is clearly not referring to the Holy God of Judaism or the Bible, but rather to the only kind of politically correct god that the press, liberal elite and others who embrace immorality can tolerate. Lieberman's praised for his "criticism" of Clinton, but then he voted just as Clinton wanted. In fact, he's always been there for Bill Clinton.

How is a man like this someone that a Christian, faithful Jew or pro-lifer can respect? I don't care if Joe Lieberman walks 100 miles on a Saturday to cast one more (liberal) vote, it won't make up for his absolute moral bankruptcy on the most pivotal moral issue of the 20th (and 21st) century. Are our fellow pro-lifers afraid of being called anti-Semitic if they dare to point out that Lieberman's rabid support of the pro-abortion agenda makes him unfit to be called a "moral leader"? In fact, the very best thing about Joe Lieberman is that he's Jewish, but his voting conduct indicates that he has sacrificed critical tenets of that faith on the altar of political expediency, and I would say the same thing about a Catholic, Baptist or any other person with Lieberman's egregious record on moral issues.

Of course, the problem is the acceptance of abortion and the pro-abortion position in both political parties. The real reason most "pro-life" public figures won't confront Lieberman's hypocrisy is because that would mean they would also have to condemn the positions of politicians who have a "R" behind their names—so, they just throw away life as a wedge issue. What we fail to condemn, we condone. God help us.

Lyman wrote as an individual member of LDI's Board of Directors only and in no other capacity.

The Archbishop of Los Angeles created a stir when he accepted Vice President Al Gore's invitation to do the invocation at the Democrat's convention. Some pro-life leaders urged Cardinal Roger Mahoney to change his mind about appearing at the event. But Mahoney did not waste the opportunity as he called for an end to abortions.

"In you, oh, God, we trust that you will keep us ever committed to protect the life and well-being of all people, but especially unborn children, the sick and the elderly," Mahoney prayed. He is one of the leading voices against abortion in California.

In 1996, the late Cardinal Joseph Bernardin turned down an invitation to pray at the Democrat's national convention in Chicago. In 1984 and 1992, when Democrats held conventions in New York City, the late Cardinal John O'Connor also declined. Both said their reason was the party's support of abortion. In 1992, Bill Clinton denied a prominent pro-life governor, the late Robert P. Casey, D-Penn., an opportunity to speak at the convention.

The nomination of Gore to be the presidential candidate for the Democrats was not a unanimous decision. Ken Lucas, the only Democrat in Kentucky's congressional delegation, refused to cast his vote for Al Gore's nomination at the convention. "I'm pro-life and he's pro-choice," Lucas said in a telephone interview reported by AOLNews.com. Lucas is seeking reelection in Kentucky's fourth district, a very conservative area that was represented by Republicans for more than 30 years prior to his election in 1998.

In New York's hotly contested Senate race, Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) has endorsed Hillary Rodham Clinton. Gloria Feldt, president of PPFA, said the organization backed Clinton because of Rep. Rick Lazio's, R-N.Y., entry into the race. Lazio replaced New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani, a strong supporter of abortion, who withdrew from the race for health reasons.

"Once Lazio got in the race, it was an easy decision," Feldt told *The New York Times*. "Rick Lazio would like you to think he is pro-choice. He is not. He is multiple choice," Feldt told the Associated Press. Although Lazio has generally favored abortion, he opposes the use of federal money to fund the deed.

"I believe in choice for all women, not just some women," Clinton said. "I will never vote to confirm a judge to the Supreme Court who could vote to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. My opponent won't say that simple statement," she added. Lazio has repeatedly said he rejects "litmus tests" for Supreme Court nominees. Both PPFA and its New York state chapter support Clinton.

Pro-life activists note that many Republican politicians are short on promises, regardless of the side they claim to support. For example, Bush has not promised to do much more than sign a ban on partial-birth abortions. This unwillingness recently caught the attention of journalist Joseph Farah, who wrote a column entitled, "Consider Yourself Warned" for World Net Daily:

I'm getting a lot of letters, these days, from people who say I'm being too tough on George W. Bush. "He's our only chance!" these missives plea. "Wait until after the election to criticize him. Focus your attention on the real enemy—Al Gore."

Our only chance? For what? What does George W. Bush stand for that is fundamentally different than Al Gore...Wait until after the election? Oh, don't worry. There will be plenty of criticism left to go around after the election as well...And, as for Al Gore, I don't think I'm high on his list of favorite journalists.

But let me give you one more concrete example of why, I believe, all those folks writing now pleading for mercy for Bush will be the same people writing to me complaining about him after Jan. 20.

One of the most frequently mentioned imperatives cited for supporting Bush over Gore is the selection of U.S. Supreme Court justices. I agree this is an important consideration for evaluating any presidential candidate. The U.S. Supreme Court has been severely misused by activist judges over the years so that it has become indistinguishable—in practice—from the legislative branch of government.

These same Bush advocates try to appeal to my sense of morality on the issue of abortion. Gore, they say, will continue to appoint justices who seem to believe that any pregnancy not ending in abortion is a miscarriage of justice. Bush, they maintain, will bring some sanity to the court by appointing justices who are more open-minded when it comes to issues of life and death.

Is that so? Do we have any evidence to suggest that? What exactly is Bush's track record on judicial appointments as governor of Texas?

Perhaps the best and most concise explanation I have seen on this subject came, oddly enough, in *The New York Times* in July. Reporter Jim Yardley wrote:

Earlier this year, the Texas Supreme Court stunned social conservatives throughout the state by issuing a 6-to-3 ruling that allowed a 17-year-old high school senior to have an abortion without telling her parents.

"It was shocking," said Joe Kral, the legislative director for the Texas Right to Life Committee. It was, after all, appointees of Gov. George W. Bush who took the lead on the issue...

(A) look at Mr. Bush's record in Texas shows that he has appointed justices who have had a moderating influence on the Texas Supreme Court, often regarded as among the most conservative and pro-business in the country. He has appointed four of the court's nine justices and has been a political patron for a fifth, Harriet O'Neill, who wrote the majority opinion in the parental notification case...

Debbie D. Branson, president of the Texas Trial Lawyers Association, a group that has been critical of the court and Mr. Bush over the years...agreed that the Bush appointees had started the process of moving the court back to the center...

By the Supreme Court's 1998-99 term, the liberal judicial watchdog group Court Watch found that Mr. Bush's appointees were "eliminating the excesses of the G.O.P. old guard."

Now, I know that's not likely to persuade you Bush die-hards who keep writing to me. I realize you have made up your minds to vote for the lesser of two evils. I understand that this is a matter of faith with you. But, for those of you who don't like to participate in evil— even if it's the lesser of two—I suggest you give serious thought to Bush's judicial record in Texas. If you are voting for George W. Bush because you think he will bring America a better U.S. Supreme Court, I suggest you are being misled.

I know. I know. Your next question is: "Well, Farah, what's the alternative? If not Bush, who then? Gore is the only other candidate who has a chance to win."

I agree. There are only two realistic possibilities for victory in November—Bush and Gore. And I am not here to urge you to support one particular third- or fourth- or fifth-party candidate. But I am telling you, once again, that I will not waste my vote on a candidate who, even by the admission of many of his most vociferous proponents, is a lighter shade of evil.

Remember where you heard it, folks. Don't come crying to me about being "betrayed" a few months down the road. Bush's record is clear. Support him and you are endorsing his past and his future.

It remains to be seen whether pro-life proponents will flock to the polls in droves for Bush. While some pro-life leaders have expressed lukewarm support for Bush, others have been more enthusiastic. However, more have withheld their support from the Republican candidate than in any election since Jimmy Carter defeated pro-abortion Gerald Ford in 1976.

REPUBLICANS AND N.R.L.C. CRITICIZED

The Free Congress Foundation's Judicial Selection Monitoring Project has criticized the Republican-controlled Senate for confirming President Bill Clinton's radically liberal judicial nominees. Clinton has already appointed as many judges to the Federal bench as President Ronald Reagan did during his eight years in office.

"Those led to believe that Republicans have blocked Clinton nominees should consider an important fact," said Thomas L. Jipping, director of the Project and a member of LDI's Board of Advisors. "Though Mr. Reagan faced a Senate of his own party for six years, Mr. Clinton has appointed judges at a faster rate while facing an 'opposition' Senate for six years. Since becoming the majority, Republicans have handed Mr. Clinton a 240-1 judicial appointment run," Jipping wrote in *The Washington Times*.

Jipping noted that 28 of the Republican Senators who voted to confirm Mary McLaughlin to the United States District Court enjoy a 100 percent pro-life record, according to the standards set by the National Right to Life Committee Inc. Yet in 1998, McLaughlin received an award from the American Civil Liberties Union for her pro-abortion work.

Senator Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, is chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which is responsible for this debacle. Jipping is also critical of Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., for his unwillingness to act. The basic reason? A lack of courage on the part of Senate leaders. And pro-life leaders have not seen fit to "score" such votes as pro-life issues.

COMMUNIST FORCED ABORTION POLICY

The San Jose Mercury News reports that a mother was forced to have an abortion in Communist China after she violated its tyrannical birth control policies. But a "family planning" official denied that the child was killed after birth. The mother was reportedly taken to a birth-control clinic in the village of Caidian where the abortion was committed. The Communist government had initially denied that any such event occurred.

A spokesman for the Communist Chinese, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, said, "The baby was the couple's fourth child. They broke the regulations of China's family planning policy."

The official denied a story in the London *Times* that claimed the baby had survived an attempt to induce an abortion and had been born healthy. The *Times* report claimed "family planning" officials took the baby, repeatedly kicked him and then drowned the child in a flooded rice paddy in front of the parents.

Since the 1970s, China's communists have limited urban couples to one child, while rural families, in deference to traditional preferences for boys, may have two children if the first is a girl. The policy has led to the births of a large number of boys compared to girls. It has also contributed to the raising of unruly children because parents

tend to spoil their only child—the one precious child the government allows them to keep. The one-child policy has led to forced abortions, huge fines and other punishments to enforce government-set birth limits, although communist officials insist that abuses are rare.

A brochure on family planning issued by Communist China's cabinet says the government is "against promoting induced abortion as a means of family planning." It claims the numbers of induced abortions are on the decline in many areas and that, when "required," they are committed under "safe" conditions.

Discussions regarding trade relations with Communist China are now basically devoid of talk about its forced abortion policy. American politicians, for the most part, see the issues of "business" and "morality" as separate. Similarly, when Mike Wallace interviewed Communist Chinese dictator Jiang Zemin on "60 Minutes" (aired September 3, 2000), the population control policy was never raised. It has become an accepted practice among many Westerners.

A PRO-LIFE VISION

Howard Phillips, the presidential nominee of the United States Constitution Party, recently wrote about his vision of a pro-life America. The article, entitled, "To Achieve Victory First You Must Seek It: Ending 'Legal' Abortion In America," is reprinted here:

The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, at the very heart of the Bill of Rights, stipulates that, "No person...may be deprived of life without due process of law." The meaning of this provision is quite simply that, before a pre-born child may be put to death, he or she must first be accused of a capital crime, indicted by a grand jury, convicted on the testimony of two or more witnesses, and sentenced to death. Unfortunately, some 40 million pre-born American children have been slaughtered, in comprehensive disregard of their Constitutional right to life.

Republican Supreme Court Justice Harry Blackmun (in *Roe v. Wade*) and Republican Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens (in *Casey v. Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania*) both confessed that, if the unborn child were treated as a legal person, his or her right to life would be Constitutionally protected wherever the laws of the United States apply. The President of the United States takes an oath not merely to support the Constitution, but to "defend" it. Accordingly, any legitimate holder of the highest office in the land would, on his first day in office, proclaim that it is the policy of his administration to acknowledge the legal personhood of the unborn.

The President must follow a personhood proclamation by naming United States attorneys, in every district throughout the United States, for whom the *number one* responsibility will be to prosecute, enjoin, and close down every abortion mill and every abortionist within their respective jurisdictions. He would encourage members of Congress, governors, state legislators, and local magistrates to follow suit in using their official authority to implement the principle that the first duty of the law is to prevent the shedding of innocent blood.

In 1973, during my service as director of the United States Office of Economic Opportunity, I used every bit of authority accorded me to cut off funding for organizations that promoted or performed abortions. Unfortunately, for political reasons, my Republican superiors in the White House overturned my decisions, even as they failed to repudiate the argument of Lewis Hellman, then-Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, that it is more cost-effective to encourage legal abortion than to permit children to grow up and be placed on welfare. This "Hitlerian" notion was one factor in my decision to leave the Republican Party, as I did in 1974. Today, both major parties continue to appropriate funds for the National Endowment for the Arts, Planned Parenthood, and homosexual activist groups

Any President should not only be ready to exercise his constitutional veto of any and all authorizations and appropriations to organizations, domestic or foreign, which perform or promote abortions, he must also use "impoundment" authority to immediately close down the multi-million dollar subsidies to such groups as Planned Parenthood and to the United Nations Population Fund. Not a single penny of government money would go to any politician, any school, any cultural activity, any legal services lawyer, any advocacy group, or any other organization or program which promotes abortion.

A constitutional President will cancel Most Favored Nation trade status for Communist China, which annually provides some \$80 billion in fungible financial benefits, which aid the Beijing tyranny in its policy of snatching unborn children from the wombs of their mothers and limiting parents to one child per family. Similarly, all funding for Red China laundered through the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the U.S. Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Council, and other similar entities must be terminated.

One of the big lies, which too many pro-lifers have been sold by the Republican hierarchy, is that you cannot end "legal" abortion without a constitutional amendment or without a change in the Supreme Court. This is nonsense. *Roe v. Wade* is

indeed binding on the parties to the case, but on none others. No constitutional amendment is needed to enforce the Fifth Amendment principle protecting the rights of the unborn. Nor does the Constitution grant the Supreme Court authority of any kind to amend the plain language or original purpose of our nation's charter.

Article V of the Constitution sets forth the only two procedures by which changes in the Constitution may be achieved: a) a convention may propose amendments for consideration by the states or b) Congress may propose amendments for consideration by the states. Otherwise, the Constitution stands as written, subject to modification only by those amendments, which have been ratified in accordance with its explicit provisions.

When it comes to judicial appointments, the President must require every candidate for nomination and confirmation by the Senate to publicly affirm his commitment to the principle that the unborn child is a human person from the moment of conception—with all of the rights to life to be accorded every other human person. He must insist on that litmus test—not only for nominees to the Supreme Court, but for nominees to every Federal court.

My friend, Pat Buchanan, says that he would name only pro-life judges to the Supreme Court, but would respect the custom of “senatorial courtesy” with respect to the inferior Federal courts. Under that system, the President agrees to appoint Federal judges, regardless of ideology, recommended by their home state Senators. This is a dangerous concession. Very often, judges who have gained experience in district courts and in courts of appeal wind up as nominees to the United States Supreme Court. If a Senator wants to have his or her candidate considered for any Federal judicial position, that legislator should understand that this would be done only for persons who have publicly acknowledged the legal personhood of all unborn children and pledged to rule consistently in defense of innocent life.

Unlike George Bush and Dick Cheney, I believe in the right to life without exception. My wife and I have six children and 12 grandchildren. I have on various occasions been privileged to be present in delivery rooms as children were being born. I have never seen an exception, only boys and girls endowed with immortal souls by Almighty God.

In cases of rape or incest, the child should not be executed for the sins of his or her father. The leader of the Free World must defend every one of these children—from the moment of conception to *uninduced* natural death, at the end of their life spans.

Because all Federal courts below the Supreme Court level are creatures of statute, they are each subject to “the power of the purse” and to veto authority. The President should not sign any piece of legislation which carries forward funding for lower court judges who, in contradiction of the Constitution, support in their rulings the destruction of unborn children.

Presidential appointments in other areas of government are often also significant for those of us who wish to end abortion and stop Federally promoted “population control.” We need a President who will appoint a pro-life Secretary of State who is committed to fight against even one penny of American taxpayer dollars being used to fund international population control activities, whether through the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, or by means of the foreign aid unconstitutionally bestowed on foreign regimes.

We need a President who will appoint a Secretary of Defense committed to prohibiting the performance of abortion on any member of the armed forces. We need a President who will name a Secretary of Education who will see to it that tax dollars are used to promote respect for life, not to undermine that respect.

Opposition to socialized medicine is also a crucial pro-life issue. When the government, through regulation and subsidy, has monopoly control over the supply of health care, and the demand exceeds the supply, the checks and balances of the marketplace having been removed and the doctor-patient relationship having been undermined, politicians and bureaucrats will have the power to decide who lives and who dies. The lives of the elderly, the handicapped, the chronically ill are increasingly at political risk, to the degree that government controls our access to medical care. The President must undo the damage that has been done by Republicans and Democrats in Congress whose political cowardice has contributed to undermining the world's finest system of medical care.

The Constitution of the United States specifies the powers granted to the Federal government. The Tenth Amendment stipulates that the states and the people retain all those powers not expressly delegated and enumerated. Today our elected representatives in Washington, D.C., operate in defiance of the Constitution by legislating in areas where they have been granted no authority. Moreover, they have improperly surrendered legislative authority, which the Constitution vests exclusively in Congress.

We need a President who will fulfill his duty as the chief defender of the Constitution, and veto any and all enactments that violate the supreme law of the land. No funds will be approved for any agency, program, or activity that is not specifically authorized by the Constitution. Furthermore, the President should repeal all unconstitutional Executive Orders and Declarations of Emergency, which usurp Congressional authority.

What will be the legacy of the vote you cast for President? If you don't vote for what you believe, you won't get what you want. Don't waste your vote. Invest it in your family's future. No candidate "deserves" your support. Make him earn it.

The Constitution Party will field candidates in many races throughout the United States.

CAUGHT BETWEEN A ROCK...

The Pro-Life Movement has a history of being placed in a tough political position. The latest involves increasing evidence that the unborn child feels pain during an abortion. Several British doctors have recommended anesthesia for unborn babies because the abortion procedure "involves torture prior to death." Yet many medical "professionals" deny the claim that unborn children feel pain, particularly in the first trimester.

The Daily Telegraph reports that Professor Vivette Glover of Queen Charlotte's and Chelsea Hospital in Britain, is calling for anesthesia to be used during the killing of children between who are 17 to 24 weeks in utero. "I think that the evidence is that the nervous system is starting to form by 20 weeks, maybe by 17 weeks," Glover said. "Given there is a possibility that an unborn child can feel pain we should give the fetus the benefit of the doubt." She said many questions remain about when the fetus becomes sentient, but it is "incredibly unlikely that the fetus could feel anything before 13 weeks because there is no linking to the brain at all."

So what's the problem? If pro-life leaders agree to giving unborn children anesthesia, it will serve to ease the consciences of those who support the killing of children, which could be a setback looking at the big picture. At the same time, allowing the pain to continue surely would not stop pro-abortion activists. If pro-life leaders do not agree to the administration of anesthesia, the baby suffers even more.

Another matter of concern is the increase in the number of drop-off centers for "unwanted" children. A mother may drop her baby off at a specified location with no questions asked, although a medical history is requested. If the mother does not return within a specified amount of time, the infant is placed for adoption.

The New Jersey Safe Haven Infant Protection Act, which became law on August 7, 2000, gives parents or their surrogates a way to surrender unwanted infants without fear of prosecution. Previously, a parent could be charged with child endangerment, a second-degree offense that carries a penalty of up to 10 years in prison. As long as the baby is less than 30 days old and there are no signs of abuse or neglect, an infant may be left with no questions asked at a "safe haven." The law gives a mother 21 days to reclaim the baby. Similar "safe haven" legislation has passed or is under consideration in other jurisdictions.

"Safe Haven" laws were spawned in large part due to the case involving Amy Grossberg, then a college student, and Brian Peterson, her boyfriend. The couple killed their newborn baby and placed the child in a dumpster in November 1996, shortly after Grossberg gave birth in a Delaware motel. Grossberg was recently released from a Delaware prison after serving a 24-month sentence for the death of her son. Peterson, 22, served a six-month sentence after cooperating with authorities.

Birthright has embraced the program. Terry Weaver, its national director, said the organization promises anonymity to the women it helps. "Our whole purpose is to help girls and women with problem pregnancies," Weaver told the Associated Press. "We promise confidentiality."

Another pro-life leader embracing the new law is New Jersey Right to Life's Marie Tasy. "I'm really happy to hear that a baby was saved. It's wonderful news. This is what the law was intended to do, save the lives of babies who would otherwise be abandoned, harmed or killed."

So what's the problem? Safe Haven laws may serve to make parents irresponsible. But if the program is not supported by pro-life leaders, it could lead to more infant deaths—in and out of the womb. Clearly, the vast majority of pro-life leaders have embraced the program.

CHILDBIRTH GOOD, ABORTION BAD

Women who undergo abortions are at greater risk for mental health problems in subsequent years, according to a study presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society (APS) held in June 2000. The

researchers studied women who received state funded medical care in California and who either had an abortion or gave birth in 1989.

Researchers examined the women's medical records for up to six years afterward and found that those who had undergone abortions had significantly higher mental health claims than women who had given birth. Women who had abortions were more than twice as likely to have two to nine treatments for mental health as women who carried to term.

Another study presented at the APS conference by researchers from the University at Albany in New York found that teenagers who had children were as well or better adjusted than teens who did not have children. Compared to their non-parenting peers, teen mothers in the study had fewer mental disorders, reported less stress, were less likely than their peers to engage in denial as a coping strategy, were less dependent on social support and reported greater satisfaction with the support they did receive.

CONFERENCE REMINDER

American Collegians for Life (ACL), which trains pro-life campus leaders to defend their position and equips young people to present a positive pro-life message, will hold its annual conference in Washington, D.C., on January 19-21, 2001. For more information, visit ACL's website at: www.aclife.org or call (202) 737-1007.

THE PILL IS NOT THE WORLD'S SAVIOR

A new study reveals that the Pill fails to curb teen pregnancies. The Electronic Telegraph reports that the study casts doubt on claims that the high rate of teenage pregnancies is the fault of poor sex education and reluctance of young people to seek medical help.

Britain has the highest teenage pregnancy rate in Western Europe. More than 100,000 women under 20 conceived in 1998, with two-thirds going on to have a baby. But the study found that of 240 teenagers who became pregnant, 71 percent discussed birth control with a general practitioner or health expert in the year before. Half had been prescribed the Pill, but became pregnant anyway.

"Our results show that most teenagers who become pregnant do access general practice for both general medical services and contraceptive advice before pregnancy. This suggests that for most teenagers fears about confidentiality and embarrassment is less of a barrier than previously supposed," said Dr. Richard Churchill, the lead researcher.

An editorial in the journal said many teenagers are not mature enough to cope with taking oral birth control every day at the same time. Professor Basil Donovan, from the University of Sydney, said doctors should encourage teenagers to use other forms of birth control such as the intrauterine device (IUD).

"Although they had free access to quality healthcare could it have been that these sexually active teenagers were at the limit of their ability to seek contraception? If that was the case then they may not have asked enough questions to understand the method that was prescribed," Donovan said.

THE PRAYER PROJECT

LDI instituted The Prayer Project to encourage prayer for those involved in the Pro-Abortion Movement and those who have not been strong in their claimed pro-life convictions. Please join us in daily prayer for these individuals: September—singer *Madonna (Louise Ciccone)*; October—author *John Irving*; November—Senator *Joseph R. Lieberman*, D-Conn.; and December—*Geraldo Rivera* of NBC News.

WORKING FOR TWO

CNSNews.com reports that a British woman with kidney failure was kept alive throughout her pregnancy by her unborn baby, whose kidneys worked for both of them. A London newspaper reported that 42-year-old Carol Davies became pregnant last year after trying unsuccessfully for 15 years. She has suffered kidney failure since 1978. Twelve weeks into the pregnancy, baby Owen's kidneys began working to clean his blood and help his mother, who is on dialysis.

“I was terrified that the toxins in my body would be too much for him and I would lose him as I did my first child four years ago,” she was quoted as saying. “But the doctors monitored my dialysis and, despite being premature, Owen is perfect. We are so lucky.”

PARENTS VS. THE STATE

Zenit News Service reports that a British judge ruled that doctors should not prolong the life of a 19-month-old child suffering from a lung disease, overruling the pleas of the child’s parents. Pro-life advocates fear that the ruling will set a precedent, placing vulnerable parents at even greater risk.

According to the London *Times*, Justice Cazalet ruled that it was not in the child’s best interests to prolong his life unnecessarily, since doctors say he is incurable and will die within a few weeks. He ordered the hospital to provide “palliative care to ease his suffering,” but doctors should not try to revive him, as that would cause further unnecessary pain.

“I am astonished that the judge should make a decision of this kind,” said Gerard Wright, a member of Alert, an anti-euthanasia group. “It sets a dangerous precedent because it is all too easy for doctors to say there is no point fighting any longer. Most of us know that there are many cases where the prospects for future life are despaired of and then events contradict the prognosis.”

The child’s parents said they were deeply upset by the judge’s decision and they condemned the unnamed London trust that brought the case. “We know our child better than anyone else and neither of us would want to cause him any unnecessary suffering,” the parents said in a joint statement. “But we should have the final decision-making power as to whether our child should receive ventilation.”

After spending eight months in the hospital, the boy went home with his parents, but still needed oxygen support and frequent trips to the hospital, sometimes in intensive care. The parents wanted to do everything possible to save the child, but the doctors disagreed, leading to the court battle, during which he became a ward of the state.

Health care workers said the boy, who is now back home, had improved. He was showing signs of vocabulary and could indicate pleasure and displeasure. Yet the judge ruled that the parents had become overly optimistic. “He will remain totally dependent and unable to feed himself or to communicate for such life as is left to him,” he said.

In Amsterdam, Netherlands, the Government has withdrawn legislation that would have allowed ill children as young as twelve to decide whether to end their own lives by assisted suicide without parental consent. (LDI’s president was able to get euthanasia activist Derek Humphry to admit in a debate on CNN that this is part of his goal.)

The Associated Press reports that exclusion of the clause was likely to improve the chances for passing a broader bill legalizing assisted suicide, which is now accepted practice in Holland under certain guidelines even though it is still technically outlawed. The Ministry of Justice said it had withdrawn the proposal to offer “physicians the possibility, in exceptional cases, of allowing a request for euthanasia by a minor between 12 and 16 against the wishes of their parents.”

The government of Prime Minister Wim Kok has proposed and withdrawn the legislation before. Some analysts view the actions as a ploy to win approval for the comparatively less radical provisions of the new legislation, such as legalizing euthanasia for victims of Alzheimer’s. The bill would legalize guidelines set by the government in 1993 under which doctors would not be prosecuted for assisting suicide. Last year, 2,216 cases of euthanasia and assisted suicide were recorded in the Netherlands.

QUOTABLE QUOTE

“Throughout its history, the issue of morality has been at the heart of the agonizing controversy over the ultimate punishment. Is it right for the state to take a life—regardless of how violent the criminal or how horrific the crime committed?”

— Geraldo Rivera, speaking about the death penalty, “Geraldo Rivera Reports: Justice or All,” aired on NBC-TV, September 3, 2000. Rivera does not hold to the same conviction when abortion is considered an “issue of morality.”

THE LESS OBVIOUS ENEMY

YM, a magazine aimed at teenage girls, will occasionally print articles that mention the word “virginity” in a rather positive light. The cover of its October 2000 issue includes these words: “98° On Why Virginity is Sexy.” The article, however, talks about the boy-band’s “sexy new sound.”

In its September 2000 issue, *YM* quotes singer Britney Spears as saying she would never have an abortion if she were to get pregnant. “That is such a sticky thing. I’m human, so if I made that mistake—well, first of all, my main goal is to wait until I’m married to have sex,” Spears said. She continued:

My mom said that once you do it you have so many more emotions in the relationship—especially for the girl, because it is such an intimate thing. So I wouldn’t ever go there. But if that did ever happen, I would never, personally, be able to [have an abortion], because down the road it would always haunt me. Hopefully I won’t have to think about it, because I wouldn’t put myself in that situation.

Yet in the same issue, in its “Ask Anything” column, a teenage girl writes, “Is it possible to get birth-control pills without my family’s knowing about it?” The answer reads, in part: “If you’re sure you can’t go to your parents for support, head to your local Planned Parenthood (call 800-230-PLAN to find one near you).”

Leave it to Tiffany Scott, the 14-year-old niece of LDI’s president, to let her uncle know when magazine’s aimed at teenagers are printing something pro- or anti-life. After all, as a child, she confronted a man in a grocery store who was about to purchase a box of Cheerios. “You can’t buy that!” she told the startled man. “They kill babies!” (General Mills, the maker of Cheerios, is no longer a boycott target.)

Magazine publishers are not the only ones out to hurt your children. Have you watched television lately? Consider these programs that appear on networks carried by many cable companies:

- “Undressed” airs on MTV. The program, which features some of the worst acting in the world, is set on a college campus, but the show could more appropriately be called “Sex University.” From homosexual sex, sex for three, playing with birth control, and getting naked, “Undressed” is probably the most vulgar show on the air—and it is aimed at teenagers and young adults. (It’s difficult to explain just how bad this program is for young people.)
- “Strip Poker” airs most notably on USA Network. A team of men takes on a team of women. After each question is answered, one person takes off (sometimes with the help of the other contestants) an article of clothing. This is usually accompanied by erotic or provocative dancing. Contestants routinely strip down to their underwear.
- “Don’t Forget Your Toothbrush,” which airs on Comedy Central, consists of games that give contestants the chance to win a trip. In one game, a blindfolded woman was asked to put her hands under the Scottish kilts of four men and identify what she found. The fourth man was replaced with her boyfriend. What did she find under his kilt? His naked genitalia.

Many programs such as “Drew Carey,” “Spin City,” “That ’70s Show,” “Friends,” and “Ally McBeal” have become increasingly vulgar. While most of the humor on these programs relies on innuendo and double-meanings, some is just out in the open. Yet many people who would say they object to such humor are watching these programs—often with their children. Needless-to-say, this sends the message that parents are too weak to practice what they preach or it is not very important to them.

Executives whose shows appear on cable networks seem to believe anything goes. The 2000-2001 season promises to be much worse—and not just on cable.

POSITIVE POLLS RELEASED

A Reuters/Zogby International survey shows that 60.8% of Latino Americans and 53.5% of Arab Americans said they favored banning abortions except when a mother’s life is at risk, compared with 46.8% of Italian Americans,

44.2% of African Americans and 47% of Asian Americans. Only 20% of Jewish Americans said that they supported a ban on abortion.

An ABC News/*Washington Post* poll shows declining support for legal abortion. Support for legal abortion is seven points below its 1995 level, according to the poll, while opposition is seven points higher. While 53 percent now favor legal abortion in all or most cases, 43 percent oppose it in all or most cases. That compares to a 60-36 percent division five years ago.

Consistent with other polls, women take a more pro-life position than do men, 56 percent to 50 percent. Opposition to abortion has risen slightly amongst both genders since 1995.

ACTION SPEAKS LOUDER

Please take the following steps over the next two months:

- Write to Mr. William E. Kennard, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, 445 - 12th St. SW, Washington, DC 20554. Tell him that you are tired of programs like “Undressed” and “Strip Poker” that hide behind the fact that they are seen on cable to continue showing trash. Send a copy to your two United States Senators and member of Congress.
- See “The Prayer Project” on page 8.
- Write to four corporate supporters of Planned Parenthood. You choose which corporations should receive your letter.
- Find out where all candidates whose names will be on the ballot in your area stand on abortion. Find out how important the issue is to him or her as well.
- Vote your conscience on November 7, 2000! Do not pass up your chance to do so.

The Caleb Report is an official periodical of Life Decisions International. It is published six times per year. Subscribers also receive *Special Reports*, which is published quarterly. Send changes of address to LDI at P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161.

Views expressed in this publication may not represent those of all members of LDI's Board of Directors, staff, or supporters. Nothing herein should be considered an endorsement of or opposition to any legislation or candidate for public office.

To schedule a speaker, call (202) 347-2066. Our e-mail address is: ldi-hq@usa.net. Thanks for your support!

This publication may be copied so long as it is done in full. It may be quoted so long as proper citation is provided with the quotation.

©2000 Life Decisions International.